

*Example 3. Unrelated garage.* City Y issues bonds with proceeds of \$50 million for construction of a new public safety building (\$30.5 million) and for improvements to an existing courthouse (\$15 million). Y uses \$3 million of the bond proceeds for renovations to an existing privately operated cafeteria located in the courthouse. The bonds are secured, in part, by the cafeteria. Y also uses \$1.5 million of the proceeds to construct a privately operated parking garage adjacent to a private office building. The private business use of the parking garage is unrelated to any government use of proceeds of the issue. Since the proceeds used for unrelated uses and disproportionate uses do not exceed 5 percent of the proceeds, the unrelated or disproportionate use test is not met.

*Example 4. Disproportionate use of garage.* County Z issues bonds with proceeds of \$20 million for construction of a hospital with no private business use (\$17 million); renovation of an office building with no private business use (\$1 million); and construction of a garage that is entirely used for a private business use (\$2 million). The use of the garage is related to the use of the office building but not to the use of the hospital. The private business use of the garage results in \$1 million of disproportionate use because the proceeds used for the garage (\$2 million) exceed the proceeds used for the related government use (\$1 million). The bonds are not private activity bonds, however, because the disproportionate use does not exceed 5 percent of the proceeds of the issue.

*Example 5. Bonds for multiple projects.* (i) County W issues bonds with proceeds of \$80 million for the following purposes: (1) \$72 million to construct a County-owned and operated waste incinerator; (2) \$1 million for a County-owned and operated facility for the temporary storage of hazardous waste prior to final disposal; (3) \$1 million to construct a privately owned recycling facility located at a remote site; and (4) \$6 million to build a garage adjacent to the County-owned incinerator that will be leased to Company T to store and repair trucks that it owns and uses to haul County W refuse. Company T uses 75 percent of its trucks to haul materials to the incinerator and the remaining 25 percent of its trucks to haul materials to the temporary storage facility.

(ii) The \$1 million of proceeds used for the recycling facility is used for an unrelated use. The garage is related use. In addition, 75 percent of the use of the \$6 million of proceeds used for the garage is allocable to the government use of proceeds at the incinerator. The remaining 25 percent of the proceeds used for the garage (\$1.5 million) relates to the government use of proceeds at the temporary storage facility. Thus, this portion of the proceeds used for the garage exceeds the proceeds used for the temporary storage facility by \$0.5 million and this ex-

cess is disproportionate use (but not unrelated use). Thus, the aggregate amount of unrelated use and disproportionate use financed with the proceeds of the issue is \$1.5 million. Alternatively, under paragraph (c)(3)(iii) of this section, the entire garage may be treated as related to the government use of the incinerator and, under that allocation, the garage is not disproportionate use. In either event, section 141(b)(3) limits the aggregate unrelated use and disproportionate use to \$4 million. Therefore, the bonds are not private activity bonds under this section.

[T.D. 8712, 62 FR 2297, Jan. 16, 1997]

**§ 1.141-10 Coordination with volume cap. [Reserved]**

**§ 1.141-11 Acquisition of nongovernmental output property. [Reserved]**

**§ 1.141-12 Remedial actions.**

(a) *Conditions to taking remedial action.* An action that causes an issue to meet the private business tests or the private loan financing test is not treated as a deliberate action if the issuer takes a remedial action described in paragraph (d), (e), or (f) of this section with respect to the nonqualified bonds and if all of the requirements in paragraphs (a) (1) through (5) of this section are met.

(1) *Reasonable expectations test met.* The issuer reasonably expected on the issue date that the issue would meet neither the private business tests nor the private loan financing test for the entire term of the bonds. For this purpose, if the issuer reasonably expected on the issue date to take a deliberate action prior to the final maturity date of the issue that would cause either the private business tests or the private loan financing test to be met, the term of the bonds for this purpose may be determined by taking into account a redemption provision if the provisions of § 1.141-2(d)(2)(ii) (A) through (C) are met.

(2) *Maturity not unreasonably long.* The term of the issue must not be longer than is reasonably necessary for the governmental purposes of the issue (within the meaning of § 1.148-1(c)(4)). Thus, this requirement is met if the weighted average maturity of the bonds of the issue is not greater than 120 percent of the average reasonably expected economic life of the property